



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,274	02/21/2002	Ken Masumitsu	JP920000471US1	9785
48/062 7590 12/24/2008 RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP 1300 POST ROAD SUITE 205 FAIRFIELD, CT 06824				
EXAMINER				
CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2421				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,274

Applicant(s)

MASUMITSU ET AL.

Examiner

SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY

Art Unit

2421

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 9/17/08, with respect to claims 1-19 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Office Action of 7/9/08 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (6408128) in view of Herz (5758257).

Regarding claim 1, Abecassis discloses a content digest system comprising:
a content provider comprising content, wherein the content provider furnishes content and meta data describing the content to a digest server (FIGS. 4-5; col. 2, lines 23-27; col. 11, line 60-col. 12, line 1; col. 16, lines 19-25);
the digest server comprising a content digest for the content, wherein each of the plurality of content segments correspond to at least one characteristic value (col. 19, lines 35-55), and wherein the digest server generates the content digest by using the importance levels, the content digest comprising at least one of the content segments (col. 16, lines 26-36; col. 21, lines 31-45); and

a client, wherein the client receives the content digest (col. 28, lines 4-21, col. 39, lines 6-12).

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments;

In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 2, Abecassis teaches wherein the digest server uses determined content scores, which correspond to characteristic values, for each of the content segments to determine the importance levels (FIGS. 5A-5E; col. 16, lines 19-25; col. 18, lines 47-53).

Regarding claim 3, wherein the digest server determines a current determined content score for a current content segment based on determined content scores for similar content segments, the similar content segments determined through a measure comparing frequencies of a plurality of characteristic values for the current content segment with frequencies of a plurality of characteristic values for previously shown content segments is further met by teachings of Graves et al., US 5,410,344, which is incorporated by reference in Abecassis at col. 40, line 9 (Graves et al.: col. 6, lines 26-34; col. 8, lines 57-64; and col. 9, lines 4-34).

Regarding claim 4, wherein the client includes a user profile having user profile content scores for at least one viewed content segment for a user (reads on discussions in both Graves et al. at col. 9, lines 13-22 and Abecassis at col. 5, lines 26-34), and wherein the digest server calculates importance levels for the at least one viewed content segment based on a probability and based on the current determined content score for the at least one viewed content segment, a user profile content score for the at least one viewed content segment, or both the current determined content score and the user profile content score (reads on teachings in both Graves et al. at col. 6, lines 26-34; col. 9, lines 4-34 and Abecassis at col. 42, lines 49-61), wherein the probability is determined from at least one of a plurality of frequencies, each of the frequencies indicating how often a characteristic value occurs in the content segment (reads on discussions in both Graves et al. at col. 8, lines 57-64 and Abecassis at col. 35, lines 6-24).

Regarding claim 5, Abecassis teaches a content digest system, for preparing a predetermined digest for content provided by a content provider and for providing the predetermined digest, comprising: profile identification means (analyzing user preference) for identifying the user profile of a user who has received content (Abecassis: col. 41, 8-22; col. 58, lines 45-51); and update means (updating routines) for updating, based on the user profile, the importance level of at least one of the plurality of content segments (reads on discussions in both Abecassis at col. 39, lines 7-12 and Graves et al. at col. 6, lines 60-62; col. 7, lines 37-54; col. 9, lines 13-22).

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

importance level estimation means for estimating an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments;

In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 6, see claim analysis of claim 3.

Regarding claim 7, see claim analysis of claim 4.

Regarding claim 8, Abecassis teaches the claimed video digest system for providing a video digest for a user comprising: a meta data characteristic value database adapted to store characteristic values obtained from meta data included in video content (Abecassis: col. 2, lines 23-27; col. 19, lines 35-55); determine the importance level for a scene based on a determined content score for the scene (reads on disclosures in both Abecassis at col. 56, lines 49-54 and Graves et al. at col. 4, lines 28-35; col. 6, lines 26-34; col. 9, lines 4-34) a user profile content score for the scene, or both the determined content score and the user profile content score; and a video digest data generator, for selecting, based on the importance levels, a predetermined number of scenes, for sorting the selected scenes along the time axis, and for generating video digest data (reads on teachings in both Abecassis at col. 19, lines 5-22; col. 24, lines 24-35; col. 71, line 63 through col. 72, line 11 and Graves et al. at col. 4, lines 22-51).

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

importance level calculator for estimating an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments;

In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 9, see claim analysis of claim 3.

Regarding claim 10, see claim analysis of claim 4.

Regarding claim 11, Abecassis teaches wherein the video digest data generator defines a threshold value based on the length of the time required for a video digest and sorts along a time axis the scenes that are selected based on the importance levels and the threshold value, and thereby provides a video digest (reads on teachings in both Abecassis at col. 57, lines 7-13; col. 72, lines 1-11 and Graves et al. at col. 5, lines 17-18; col. 8, lines 12-19.

Regarding claims 12-13, Abecassis teaches the claimed user terminal comprising: pre-viewing transmission means (previewer), for transmitting information for predetermined content that is selected by a user from a received content list (Abecassis: col. 2, line 42-48), and in accordance with a video digest time length desired by the user (Abecassis: col. 57, lines 7-24); reception means (user-interfacing), for receiving, following the reception of the information and the time length, a video digest and meta data from a content provider, Abecassis: col. 16, lines 26-36; col. 21, lines 31-45); and post-viewing transmission means (updating) for transmitting results that are obtained from the user who has viewed and listened to the video digest (Graves et al.: col. 6, lines 60-62; col. 7, lines 37-54; col. 9, lines 13-22).

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

wherein said video digest is created based on a processor-generated importance level for each of a plurality of content segments In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 14, Abecassis teaches the claimed video digest generation method comprising the steps of: using a characteristic value for meta data to represent each of multiple scenes that constitute content, wherein each scene corresponds to at least one characteristic value (Abecassis: col. 2, lines 23-27; col. 19, lines 35-55); calculating frequencies, each frequency indicating how many times a characteristic value of the meta data appears in the content (reads on teachings in both Abecassis at col. 35, lines 6-24 and Graves et al. at col. 8, lines 57-64); calculating a video importance level for each scene based on a probability and based on a determined content score for the scene, a user profile content score for the scene, or both the determined content score and the user profile content score, wherein the probability is determined from at least one of the frequencies (reads on discussions in both Graves et al. at col. 6, lines 26-34; col. 9, lines 4-34 and Abecassis at col. 56, lines 48-54) and selecting a predetermined number of scenes, based on the obtained video importance level (Abecassis: col. 16, lines 28-36 and FIG. 5A-5E); and generating a video digest from the predetermined number of scenes (Abecassis: col. 21, lines 32-45 and FIG. 7G for summary of desired program).

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

wherein said video importance level is calculated by a processor;

In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content

segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 15, see claim analysis of claim 3.

Regarding claim 16, Abecassis teaches the claimed video digest generation method, wherein the determined content scores are based on user profiles obtained for multiple users who have viewed and listened to the video digest (Abecassis: col. 24, lines 51-59).

Regarding claim 17, Abecassis teaches the claimed video digest generation method, wherein the video digest is generated by selecting a predetermined number of scenes based on a video digest time length received from a user to whom the video digest is to be distributed (Abecassis: col. 57, lines 7-24).

Regarding claim 18, Abecassis teaches the claimed video digest reception method comprising the steps of: transmitting a user profile that includes information for

content desired by a user, information for a video digest time length for viewing and listening (Abecassis: col. 57, lines 7-24); and receiving a video digest comprising multiple scenes, sorted along a time axis, that constitute content that reflects the video digest time length, and meta data included in each of the scenes (Abecassis: col. 21, lines 32-45; col. 57, lines 7-24);

However, Abecassis fails to disclose:

wherein said video digest is created based on a processor-generated importance level for each of a plurality of content segments;

In an analogous art, Herz teaches:

Wherein a server converts the meta data into characteristic values, wherein the digest server calculates an importance level for each of a plurality of content segments (By converting meta data into numerical values, the importance level is calculated; the higher the numerical value, the higher the importance. col. 11, lines 31-35, col. 13, lines 30-39);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Abecassis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automating the process of assigning importance levels to content.

Regarding claim 19, Abecassis teaches the claimed step of transmitting information that is obtained from the user as a result of viewing and listening to the

video digest (reads on discussions in both Abecassis at col. 42, lines 49-61 and also Graves et al. at col. 6, lines 60-62; col. 7, lines 37-54; col. 9, lines 13-22).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/Sumaiya A Chowdhury/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421

